

THE
Quakers Plainness
DETECTING
FALLACY.
IN
Two Short Treatises:

I. The First is Answer to an Abusive Epistle, styl'd, *The Quakers Quibbles*; and the Comparison therein between the *Mugglerians* and *Quakers*, proved *Aburd* and *Unjust*.

II. The Second, being a *brief Impartial* account of the *Former's Complaints* in their *Quakers Appeal Answered* [whose *Injustice, Partiality* and *false Glories* have given the chief Occasion of their late Controversy].

By George Whitehead.

It hath been the Fruit of Lyons, Hol. 10. 25.

Printed in the Year 1694.

THE

DIRECTING

ACCY.

OF THE

OF THE
OF THE
OF THE

OF THE
OF THE
OF THE

OF THE
OF THE
OF THE

OF THE

Unprejudiced Reader,

IF the TRUTH could have been overcome by Falshood, or buried under Reproaches, or stopt with Popular Clamours, or undermined by the secret Combinations of its Adversaries, or suppressed by Injustice and Partiality; I confess, these implacable and envious Men, who are chiefly concerned against us, would have had the Day, and their Iniquity been triumphant and remained uncontrollable: But such their Weapons and Engines have not prevailed, nor ever shall effect the Enemies Designs against God's Cause or Heritage. Had they been Men of Tender Conscience, or respected the Honour of Religion more than Interest and Popular Fame, they would not have given us Occasion for these publick Confests, neither by abetting a manifest Forger, nor by lying Pamphlets or

false Relations that they so frequently bring forth, and cause to be spread against us: But their hard Hearts, their fretful striving Spirits vent forth their Envy, and declare their Spleen and Ill-will towards us, only that they want Power to effect their Revenge upon us; to evince this I could give divers Instances, that an Inveterate Persecuting Spirit hath long been, and yet lives and works in divers of these Baptist-Teachers and Leaders; such as cannot suffer Persecution themselves for their Religion, but a little Storm or small Gult would blow them into their Holes and Obscurities again, and yet they seem to envy the Liberty, and grudge the Prosperity of others; we have Cause to think, that even Ours is an Eye-Sore to them: If they urge me herein, I doubt not but I can particularly demonstrate it, and in some Measure shew the Antiquity of their persecuting Envy; and of late their Outrage is ominous of their Decrease, Confusion and Ruin: I am sensible the secret Hand of God hath been

been, and is at Work against this Perverse Generation, because of their Hypocrisie and Envy against us his People: And how do they revile, Infamize, Baite and Bark at that Sincere-hearted and Zealous Man William Penn? What Libels, Pamphlets, Books, Squibs, Cantings, Jeers, Silly Drolls and Railing have his Adversaries (Baptists and their Assistants) let fly at him, as Men full freight with Envy, by all which both He and many more are but the more confirmed against them and their Way, resolving (if they were otherwise to seek) they would never be Dipt by these Baptists into their Spirit, Religion or Church. Of late I have met with a very partial and scornful Pamphlet, styled, The Quakers Quibbles, said to be set forth in an Expostulatory Epistle to W. Penn: unto which I thought meet to write this following brief Tract, though it be not directed to me, I am concerned for the Truth and People of God, being both abused through the Envy and Folly of their Confused Adversaries: We find she
said

said Pamphlet subscribed with the Name,
 Thomas Thompson, p. 26. And in
 Conclusion, Thomas Thompson, whe-
 ther this be the Real Author's Name some
 question; however, some of the Bap-
 tists have commended and promoted his
 Work, as an Ingenuous Piece, who have
 pretended themselves ignorant of the Au-
 thor of it: but whatever he be, he writes
 like a Confident Controuler of W. P. and
 the Quakers, and would seem to be some-
 body; but his Complement of Sir, and thou
 Sir, and thou, &c. as also, Mountebank,
 Fool, &c. with much more such Language
 to W. P. looks but oddly; a strange Way
 of complementing from such a Person as
 would be thought a Moderator and Indif-
 ferent Pen! But whoever the Author
 be, his Work will further declare what dark
 Spirit it came from, and that it much re-
 sembles that of a Prejudiced, Angry
 Anabaptist, only disguised and mixed
 with a little of different Style and silly
 Drollery: However, he and these Bap-
 tists that so much envy us, and out of their
 Pride

Pride and Emulation would be smiling at W. Penn, because of his Testimony for the Truth among us, and his Zeal against Truth's Adversaries, they do but strive and quarrel in vain, and I must tell them, there was a Hand of the Lord in raising him up (as also will appear in many more) to bear Witness against such a stony Generation of Hypocrites and Apostates, as of late do busy themselves and take Counsel together like malicious Incendiaries against us, and their Counsel God will bring to nought, and scatter the Proud in their Imaginations; yet I have a secret Sadness and Sorrow of Spirit because of the great Loss, Declension & Apostacy that divers, even of these Baptists are fallen into. Oh the former Zeal for Religion, Tenderness of Conscience and Desires after an Experimental and Inward Knowledge of the Spirit, Power and Work of God that were stirring in many (when they were in a Low and Suffering Condition) which now they have lost, and the Zeal of several turned
into

into Emptiness, and they grow Cold and
Dead in the Heart and Spirit of the World.
Yet there is a Remnant among them, whom
the Lord will visit and gather out, as those
other Sheep that desire to return to the great
Shepherd and Sheepfold, from off those
Barren Hills, and out of those Empty
Professions, and Dead Forms, and
Shadowy Observations under which the
Souls of many yet lie starving and pining,
for want of the True and Heavenly
Bread, which is in the Father's House.

G. W.

THE

(61)

THE
Quakers Plainness
DETECTING
FALLACY.

Section I.

Of the Partiality and Confusion of, the Pamphlet, styled, The Quakers Quibbles, and the Author's Hypocrisie and Envy.

WHereas the Author of the *Pamphlet* (whoever he be) styles himself, an *Indifferent Penn*, and would appear to be a very meek & moderate man, assuring us he is neither *Baptist* nor *Quaker*, p. 37. implying that he is an *Impartial Person* between both: But now, let the serious Reader consider and judge of this Man's Moderation and Ingenuity, who instead of impartially relating Matters of Fact (for
B others

others to judge of) all along bears upon the Quakers with hard Language, Jeers, Taunts and Canting Quibbles, comparing W. P. with a Jesuite in his Oration, and to a Mountebank or Stage-Player, accusing him with Shuffles, Railing, Clamour, ~~As~~ Railing at Billingsgate; the Author of a Lye, not only a Fool, but unjust; and us, his Friends, with Folly, Immoderation, Rancor, Malice, Obstinacy, Unreasonableness, not to say Madness, Passion, Begging, Refractoriness, Ridiculous Fancies, Weakness, Quibbling, base old Way of Evasion and Shuffling, perverse Generation, obstinately confident, and confidently obstinate, without Order or Rule, Rime or Reason, Fools fit for no Man to dispute with except some of Muggleton's Disciples, Billingsgate Rhetorick, mysterious Subtillies, &c. Unjustly and wickedly comparing Muggleton and the Quakers, or the Quakers and Muggletonians; insinuating, that both of them may be Impostors; for its possible, saith he, and all this to render us as odious as may be.

How now Baptists is this your indifferent Penn and ingenuous Writer? Can you think he hath well palliated Matters, either with Indifferency, Moderation or Impartiality between us? Or that such Work will make a Pacification, or end the Controversie? No, no, such successful Dealing and hypocritical

critical Pretences will stand you in no stead.
And pray further observe how inconsistent
your indifferent Pen is with himself in his
self-Contradictions; as,

1. Between his commending W. P. for an
excellent Rhetorician and fluent Tongue; and
so was Cicero, p. 6.

And his telling us, You give Occasion to
Persons to think and judge you a perverse Ge-
neration, without Order or Rule, Rime or
Reason, p. 25.

Was Cicero such an one then?

2. Between his proposing, that if W. P.
had this Gift of a fluent Tongue and good Voice
merely by turning Quaker, and not partly na-
tural, and partly acquired at Schools, that
would more convince him of the Truth of W. P.'s
Christianity, &c. p. 7.

And his confessing, That good Saint Paul
saith, Though I speak with the Tongues of
Men and Angels, and have not Charity I am
become as sounding Brass or a tinkling Cym-
bal, p. 9.

So then it is Charity, not the Gift of
Tongues, that is a certain Proof of Christi-
anity;

3. Between his saying, Thou madest thy
self the Author of a Lye, and shewest thy
self not only a Fool, but Unjust, p. 13.

B2

And

5011111111

And saying, *To say it is a Lye, that is neither Answer nor Argument; therefore in Love I should advise thee to leave off all such Billingf-gate Rhetorick and gross Language.*

See here how he hath condemned that as *Billingf-gate Rhetorick and gross Language* which himself hath used.

A. Between his saying to *W.P.* Perhaps thou art of a different mind from some of thy Friends as it is reported, thou hast brought them off from some ridiculous Fancies, p. 20.

And speaking of *W.P.*'s being engaged with such a People, and having received their Principles, thereby thinking himself obliged now to maintain them, p. 26.

How should he so differ with us (his Friends) being engaged with us, and obliged to maintain our Principles? Which we doubt not of his Sincerity in, whatsoever be here insinuated to the contrary.

Now after the great Noise these *Baptists* have made against us, as being no *Christians*, and the several Attempts made to prove us none; as also their begging Questions, and calling for an Evidence to prove our selves *Christians*, and not telling us what Evidence; the Author of the *Quakers Quibbles* proposeth something as Evidence, in order to convince

convince him of *W. P.'s Christianity*; and what must that be? but the Gift of Tongues immediately inspired, which he saith, the Members of the true Church in the Apostles Time had, and that if he can shew any one in our Church that hath such a Gift or Gifts given him upon his Conversion to our Way, it would put a clear Difference betwixt him and the Baptists, &c. p. 7. Also he asketh, Where is the Demonstration of the Spirit with thee in Power and mighty Signs? p. 9.

What say you Baptists to this Proposal? Must this conclude the Controversie between you and us, that if we can produce such a Sign or Evidence, it shall be taken as a Proof of our Christianity; but if not, then no Christians? And who then shall escape your Censure in this Case that have not the Gift of Tongues immediately inspired? Have not the Jesuits in this wise argued against the Protestants and reformed Churches, calling for some such Sign or Miracle to ascertain them of their being the true Church, or led by the Spirit, otherwise have urged them to return to the Church of Rome? or

And at this rate how will you Baptists escape your own Condemnation of being no Christians or Members of Christ's Church, if you cannot exhibit such an Evidence as the

B 3

Gift

Gift of Tongues inspired among you? But to say, *the Members* of the true Church (that is, in general without Exception) had that Gift, is a great Mistake (though some had) see 1 Cor. 12. 28, 29, 30. And what if God will not bestow such Gifts and Signs now; must we therefore be no *Christians*? But for ought we can learn, our Friends and Church is as low, poor, naked and destitute herein as the Baptists Church (viz. as to such former Signs and Wonders) p. 8.

And what follows? Are we not therefore the true Church? Are the Baptists willing to be thus concluded on this Ground?

By that Accusation. (viz. *Whilst you are both in the dark, you wrangle and fight, confute and confound one another to little purpose*, p. 8) He hath condemned the Baptists as well as us for wrangling and fighting in the dark, &c. It were well, they would as well see themselves thus reproveable herein, as promote the said Pamphlet as such an ingenious excellent Piece, whereby however they intimate to the World, that they are not come into the Light, but are wrangling and fighting in the dark.

But what Clamour? what Noise? what Tantralogies? what Disorder? what Disorder? what Confusion—your Unchristian Carriage, &c. p. 10.

Oh

Oh partial Man! many hundreds can testify, that this Disorder, unchristian, ye, and uncivil Carriage, and frequent Interruptions (to divert us from our Charge against T. H.) were stirred up against us by our Adversaries, as I never met with Disorder and unfair Dealing from Priests or others, in all the Disputes I have been concerned in.

Touching the Complaint of our giving Occasion by a solemn Offer for Thousands of People to meet together and that to the Hazard of their Limbs and Lives, &c. p. 10. He tells us not who gave the Occasion of that Solemn Offer; was it not the Baptists by their publick Meeting at Barbican before for T. H. his Purgation, and possessing the People against us, Boasting in our Absence, aggravated with several apparent Lyes spread the City and Countreyes by the Baptists and their Agents against us, as purposely leaving the Cury, shifting the Meeting, being afraid to meet them, &c?

And why did not W. K. and the rest seriously consider, and prudently foresee the Danger of the Meeting at that Place, as also the Trouble that would follow upon them by such injurious and base Attempts against us in our Absence? And indeed it was not prudently done in them to occasion and ap-

point such a Meeting to be in su^h a slight and weak Meeting-House as theirs at Barbican: Is it not well known that we proffered them a Meeting-House more secure, wherein there was no such Danger?

For two of us speaking at a Time, and crying hear, hear (that was to hear him that was to speak) p. 11. And what if many at once cryed, hear, hear? that was intelligible, and there was need enough; this was sometimes, when it was supposed that nighan hundred of the Anabaptists would clamor together, and make a hideous Noise and Bawling, to stop him that was about to speak; and in such wise were we Beset, Interrupted, and Hector'd by their Companies in the Galleries, and near us, upon their Leaders Example, in omuch, that we must wait a considerable time ere we could be heard.

The Charge of Shuffling and Bogling at one single Question, being afraid, &c. pag. 12. is unjust, and scornfully aggravated; for though there was some Intermiſſion before an Answer was given, it was not at all out of any Fear, or to Shuffle about it, but because it was not W. P's place then to Answer Interrogatories and unscriptural Questions, when his Adversaries had given a Charge,

Charge that we were *no Christians*, and upon the Proof, as they pretended, instead whereof they fell to *Catechising* us. 2dly, And if we had not at that Time answered one Word to the Question, but held them to the Proof of their Charge, judicious Auditors would have held us excusable.

To that of T. H's saying, *Most of the Particulars he would prove from our Principles, and the rest by Testimonies*, p. 13. he said, *the rest by Consequence.* Though here T.H. made a Stop, yet M.P. is charged with an Interruption, a Lie, a Fool and Unjust, when he did not insist on the Matter; see their dissingenuous Carping; and Reviling.

Whereas many gross things were instanced and laid against him, wherein he had most falsely and abusively personated us, as to speaking and being our own *Answers and Words*, and our *Method and Manner of Reasoning* * even in many Particulars, which he had neither * Dist. Yp. 63. & Title Page Testimony for, nor are they deducible either from our Words or Principles.

However if he say, *He will prove them by Consequence*; this bewrayes his own Fallacies in saying, *They were the Quakers Answers*; when they were but T. Hicks's Forgeries *made in our Name and Person.*

Seet.

Sect. II.

Of the Christ of God, &c.

THAT we have denied Distinctions, p. 15. is false; for true and reasonable ones we deny not.

But if our Friends Words have not deceived this Man (he saith) we own nothing but the Divine Nature to be Christ, p. 16.

Where proves he these Words to be ours? Have we not plainly and often confest also, that the Divine Nature or Word, clothed with the most holy Manhood, and as having taken Flesh of the Seed of Abraham, was and is the Christ?

Yet we must own, that if he was the Son of God before he took Flesh, he was Christ with respect to his Divine Nature, as proceeding from the Father; and that he was the Son of God before, is not denied that we know of, in which Respect he was not seen with Carnal Eyes, but with Respect to the Body which he took upon him in Time.

And as for two Natures, viz. the Divine and

and Human united in one Person, being the Christ, p. 16.

Then how consistent with this is it to say, that the Human Nature (or Christ's Body of Flesh and Blood) is Christ? p. 17, 18. Which is all one, as one while to say, that Christ is made up of a Divine and Human Nature; another while of a Human Nature or Body, and yet that Body the Body of Christ. I must confess, that if you impose upon us a Creed in such Impropropriety of Speech, and besides Scripture-Language and Phrase, or otherwise unchristian us, we must tell you, that untill you bring us plain Scripture that saith, the Human Nature is the Christ (which Phrase some do conscientiously scruple, at least, as being too low to entitle to the Christ of God) we must rather patiently bear your Censure or Damnation, then deviate from Scripture-Language (in our Creed) which is, that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, that he is God, Man, the Son of God; yea, and God manifest in Flesh, that as Mediator betwixt God and Man, he is THE MAN, Christ Jesus; that Christ's Body of Flesh and Blood that was born of the Virgin Mary, and that suffered, was crucified, dyed and rose again the Third Day, is called, *This Temple*, *John 2. 19 & 20. 12.* *Body of Jesus,* *John 2. 19 & 20. 12.* *and Luke 24. 3.*

Heb. 3. 3. and a Body hast thou prepared me; was not this the Son speaking to the Father?

As for *Jes's* great Question so much insisted on, *Whether Christ's Human Nature was a Part of Christ?* p. 17.

As it was not a Question in Scripture Phrase or Language, so it was as abruptly and sillily obtruded & begged instead of proving the Charge of our being no *Christians*: As also thus to divide *Christ* into Parts, is a Contradiction to the *Human Nature* being *Christ*.

Pray you *Baptists*, before you conclude a final Sentence upon us, agree upon a consistent Creed that you intend to stand by, if you will impose upon us to believe as you believe in Matter and Form upon Pain of Excommunication, as *Ethnicks* or *Heathens*, and finally of Damnation, and then we may answer you further as we see Occasion, you having already attempted to excommunicate us from among all *Christians* chiefly about Words,

* Which having various Significations, their being imposed hath caused Divisions and fruitless Contests.

wherein as yet you have not stated a plain and congruous Form among yourselves.

And we need not think our selves obliged further

further to answer you or defend our selves from your bare Charge of being ~~no Christians~~, until you have given us such a formal Creed, and withal explain, prove and reconcile these your Terms which you impose, question and strive about, & some of you have endeavour'd to tie us up to answer Aye or No unto, as about your Expressions, viz.

Two Natures in one Person, the Christ.

Christ's Human Nature Part of Christ.

The Body that was seen with carnal Eyes, the Christ.

Christ's Body of Flesh & Blood to be Christ, or Christ's Person.

The true Christ a Person without us, or a Personal Being without us.

But let it be further observed, that your Brother H. Grigg * confesseth
[of Jesus Christ the Son of * In his Book
God] thus, viz: That he *entit. Light*
was of the same Essence or from the Sun
Substance with the Father & of Righteous-
the holy Spirit, and that he ness, p. 94.
had a PERSONAL EXI-

STENCE or Subsistence before he did assume our Nature, &c.

See here they own a Personal Being of Christ before he assumed our Nature; they should have agreed upon the Definition of the

Words Person, and Personal Existence, and Subsistence, and clearly explain them to us in their Nature and Property; as also the Nature and Extent of the Word Human, both as they apply it to Body, to Nature, and as it relates to Man; and not darkly and dubiously to impose them upon us in their Questions, but rather be content with plain Scripture Language, and Words which the Holy Ghost hath taught, which it seems these Men are not content with, as also appears, where W. Penn confess his Belief of Christ to be of the Seed of Abraham; yet God over all, blessed forever, &c. This was and is excepted against, as not direct to the Question, p. 18. Therefore upon their variable Terms about Christ, I Propose these few plain Questions, seriously asking them:

1. If the Son of God was not in Being in the Beginning, and from Everlasting?
2. If he was not truly the Christ of God (being the Son of God) before he took Flesh upon him, or was born of the Virgin Mary?
3. If Carnal Eyes could see him simply as the Eternal Son of God, or his Glory, as of the only begotten of the Father?
4. Where doth the Scripture say, that the Human Nature is the Christ?

5. Or that Christ is a Person or Personal Being, consisting of Human Flesh and Blood without us?

6. Or that his Glorious Body in Heaven is a human Body?

7. Whether the Man Christ Jesus, the Mediator, be really separate and remote from his Church or Members, so as not to be present in his Church here on Earth?

8. If Christ be separate, remote or divided from his Church, how is he the Head thereof, or his Church a living Body without (or divided from the Head?)

If you profess you know Christ, do not impose your implicate Notions, unscriptural and unequith Terms about him, but declare your Experience of him.

Farther as to what we hold concerning the *Christ of God*, in Answer to his 20th Page.

1. Christ (who was the Word in the Beginning) in due Time came in the Flesh.

2. That though the meer Body of Jesus was not the entire Christ, yet the Name *Christ*, is sometimes given to the Body, though not so properly as to the whole Man Christ.

3. That God was in Christ, and the Father and Son are inseparable.

4. That the Distinction of Father and Son,

(24)
is not only nominal (as this Opposer implies against us) but real in the divine Relation of Father and Son, the Son as being the only-begotten of the Father, and also known as Co-Workers in the Order and Degrees of Manifestation and Discovery.

5. The Man's accusing the Quakers with this Doctrine, *That the Father is the Son, and the Son the Father; and so God the Christ of himself, and Christ the God of himself; somewhat like as Muggleton does in this Particular*, p. 20.

Though these are none of our Words, yet this savours of meer Ignorance and Envy; we do not own any such Separation between God and Christ as these Words [*The Christ of himself, and the God of himself*] do imply, Socinian-like; but that the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father; as also that the Son is *the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace*; see how plain it is, *Isa. 9. 6.*

6. *That Christ is not a Person without us*, p. 21. is not our Doctrine or Phrase that I know of or remember; only that the Title is thought too low and unscriptural, to give to the Christ of God, many Men having Gross Apprehensions about the Phrase [PERSON WITHOUT]. But Christ

Christ is confest by us, both as without us
and within us.

7. We are charged that we must hold,
*That Christ dyed not, but only the Body that
he assumed, that was prepared for him.* p. 21.

Now you Promoters of this *Q. Quibbler*
for an Ingenuous Pamphlet, I ask you if any
more of Christ properly dyed then the Bo-
dy? Do you hold that his Soul, Spirit or his
Divinity dyed? If not, the Charge is fool-
ish and silly; if you do, then are you like
Reeve and Muggleton, who have bla phe-
mously said, that *Christ's Soul and Godhead
Life dyed*, Whenas Christ's dying and being
buried, 1 Cor. 15. was properly, that the
Body dyed and was buried, to wit, the Bo-
dy of Jesus: See *Mat. 27. 58. Mark 15.
43, 45. Luke 23. 52, 46. and 24. 3. John
20. 21.*

As to what we say about seeing the Son
of God spiritually and not carnally [Or be-
tween the seeing him savingly, and not so
seeing him, &c.] The Man is hugely taken
with *J. Fox's Answer to our Distinction*,
*That he cannot but own it to be very good and
pertinent: Jeremy's Words were* (saith he)
*That then I, or any man might say by the same
Reason, that W. Penn or G. Whitehead was
never seen with bodily or carnal Eyes, because*
C the

the Excellency & better Part of them, viz. their Souls, was never seen, though their Bodies be seen, which is not the Man, p. 23. To which I reply;

It's not improbable, that if we had made such a Comparison, you Baptists would have cryed out, *O Blasphemy!*

1. To compare the Names *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead* with the Name *Christ*.

2. To compare the seeing *G.W. & W.P.* with the seeing the *Christ* of God.

3. It implies, the Name of *Christ* to be no more excellent then the Name *George* or *William*; Oh Ignorance in the Abstract!

4. Did not the Name of *Christ* as well concern the more excellent Part or Divine Nature as the Manhood, and far Excell those fleshly or outward Names of Distinction given to us as meer Men and Creatures? and that by Earthly Parents or Relations, and not from a Spirit of Prophecy, as to respect some divine Qualification or new Nature? for that must have a new Name; therefore I must look upon *J. Ives's* Answer and Similitude to be both impertinent and irrational.

Sect. III.

*Our Opposer self-condemned; his irreverent
Quibbling about Christ; and their Ignorance
of the Spirit's Evidence, who seek for
Signs, &c.*

AS for your standing Gaping well nigh an
Hour for an Answer, p. 24. If many of
you had not gaped and hideously bawled of-
ten to hinder our Answers, but had been civil,
you had been more answer'd then you were.
His Charge, *That we are fit for no man to
dispute with except some of Muggleton's Disci-
ples*, p. 25. is far enough from approving him-
self an indifferent Penn: But will the Bap-
tists own this, that they are such as Muggle-
ton's Disciples, when they propose for (or
admit of) Disputation with us?

As for W. Penn's using the Words *Lying
and Forgery, and Liar and Forger* in his
Books against *Thomas Hicks*; this the Man
accounts *gross Language*, that will hardly stand

with good Manners, nor suit with a civiliz'd man, much less with a good Christian; and to say it is a Lye, is Billingsgate Rhetorick, more fit for Scoulds that are duck'd, &c. p. 25. This is made a very capital Crime with this Author, who bids us speak Evil of no man, but be gentle, shewing all Meekness, &c. And yet he himself calls W.P. the Author of a Lye, a Fool, unjust, p. 13. and calls us Fools, Obstinate, &c. and so hath condemned himself, both as a partial and a self-contradictory Pen. But why is W.P. the Author of a Lye? The Pretence is for taking the Words out of T.H.'s Mouth before he had made an End of his Sentence; as when he said, most of the Particulars he would prove; W.P. then saying, most of them? then not all; which was upon a Stop that T.H. made there, as he and many others apprehended: Howbeit, when T.H. added, The rest he would prove by Consequence, W.P. insisted not on the first Words, but refused to admit of his Consequences, he having told the World in his Dialogue, that they were the Quakers Answers, &c. but this Writer against us, carps and traduces on every slight Occasions. Would the Baptists think it fair to be publisht in Print for Lyars, Fools and unjust on such an Account? But for W.P. his accusing T.Hicks with being both a Lyar
and

(29)
and Forger; he hath both proved him such
an one in his Books, and further urged to
prove his Charge against him publickly, since
his Abettors have endeavoured to cover and
uphold him.

But it seems it is the Language [*Lying
and Forgery, and Liar and Forger*] that is
found Fault with here; and not the Applica-
tion thereof, when as the Scriptures prove
such Language; as, *Thou lovest Lying rather
then to speak Righteousness; ye are Forgers
of Lyes, &c.* See *Psal.* 52. 3. *Job* 13. 4.
Joh. 8. 55. *Rev.* 2. 2. & 3. 9. & 21. 8. *Tit.*
1. 12.

His accusing some of the *Quakers* with
quibbling as much about the Word Body, as about
the Word Christ; I look upon it as no better
then quibbling against us, instead of proving
us guilty by plain Scripture; for to say, the
Church of Christ is his Body, and that there
is one Body and one Spirit, and that they that
are joyn'd to Christ are Members of his Body;
this is according to Scripture-Language; as
also, that the Body is one, and hath many Mem-
bers, so also is Christ; and are not the Saints
spiritually united into Christ, and unto his
spiritual and glorious Body? Is Christ Head
of his Church in any other Body, then that
whereof they are Members, and united to
him?

him? And will this admit of Christ's being Head of two separate Bodies; or of Three Christs? as his stating the Distinction upon G. Keith, That Christ was most properly taken for the Divine Nature, less properly for the human Nature; & least properly for the Carcase; pag. 28. whereas this is so far from G. Keith's proving Three Christs, that the words Human Nature and Carcase, were J. Ives's, not G. K's, as the first is herein granted, though G. Keith owns the words Divine Nature, Manhood and Body of Christ, and confess'd the Name Christ, to be given to the Body when crucified and dead, though less properly then to the Divine Nature and intire Manhood; since that the Son of God was the Christ of God; before he took upon him the Body prepared for him, as J. I. hath granted in his Book, *Inocency above Impudency*, p. 37. By his Argument, That Christ is the Son of God, Ergo, the Son of God is Christ: & as I answer'd, though I could not be heard, that the Name Christ was mutually and reciprocally given in Scripture to the Body and Spirit of Christ; as, Christ dyed and was buried, when it was properly the Body of Jesus; for his Soul or Spirit was immortal & did not dye, but was in Paradyse when his Body was buried; and that Spiritual Rock which ll Israel drank of,

was

was Christ. Doth the Scripture herein make *Two Christs*? No sure; No more will G. K. his Distinction bear *Three Christs* in *Three distinct Persons*, as the Man unscripturally and quibblingly words it, pag. 28.

And further, It is very strange that W. P. in correcting the *Baptists* and others, to set up his own as the *True Church*, must be impos'd upon to produce some of those Gifts or *Visible Demonstrations*, or *Eminent Signs*, as were in the Church in the *Apostles Days*, pag. 29. and 9. whereas he never made that a Reason, or Ground, to correct others for want of such Signs, as the Gift of *Tongues*, *Miracles*, &c. but for some Un-Christian Principle or Practice; however in this Case our present Opposers do argue as exactly like the *Jesuits & Papists* against the *Protestants*, for correcting them, as if they had serv'd seven Years at *Rome*. But let it be remember'd how the *Baptists* themselves were in this manner excepted against after their first Separation from other Churches, and gathering into a Church of their own: It was objected against them, *If the Lord be with us, where be all those Miracles which our Fathers told us of? Where be the Gifts of working Miracles which were in the primitive time, &c?* And what Defence did the *Baptists* make for themselves herein? but that *the seeking af-*

*sew, and Working Miracles in that outward
 way (that is sometimes in Scripture spoken
 of and that these men intend) is not essential
 to a Believer, and so not to a Church, nor an
 Administrator. See p. 69. of their Books, en-
 titled A Way to Sion, by D. King; printed at
 London, & reprinted at Edinburgh, 1636. Al-
 so, Thus Miracles did not prove them Disciples;
 That Miracles do not now distinguish a true
 Church from a false, Ibid. p. 135, 136. Yet, as
 if they had quite forgotten these things, and
 the Oppositions and sufferings which they for-
 merly met withal, they bring their Adversa-
 ries Objections against us.*

And seeing if we should only tell men, *We
 are in the Truth, the Light within the m will re-
 stifie to our Way, it is demonstrable by the Ef-
 fects; & that we have the Spirit, and are in the
 Power of God, and that it is within, while the
 Baptists so say they have it; as he saith p. 31, 32.
 and that all this will not decide the Contro-
 versie, nor manifest to our Opposer a real Dis-
 crimination between us, to demonstrate us
 to be in the Truth. Now as we have not this
 way imposed a Faith upon our Opposers, so
 we shall not thus impose upon either this
 man, or the Baptists; but desire he and they
 may without Prejudice seek and try further,
 and Try all things, and hold fast that which is
 Good,*

Good, and we doubt not, but where or in whom the *Spirit of Christ* lives and rules, it will manifest it self by its Fruits, for it is *Self-Evidencing*, and will discover who are the Lord's peculiar People, and who not.

But this *Quibbler* imposeth upon *W. P.* to bring something for Proof of his Church which the Baptists nor no False Church can pretend to and produce, pag. 30. Though this seems to be a hard Task, especially as to what may be pretended; yet it is no difficult matter for *W. P.* and many more to produce or demonstrate some such Effects of that Living Testimony, Presence and Power of God among us, as no false Church can produce; although herein neither *W. P.* nor any of us, will admit of Prejudiced & Envious Spirits to be our Judges or Witnesses in these matters; but we have a Record in Heaven, and also in many Consciences of the blessed Power and Presence of God with us & amongst us, Turning many from *Darkness to Light*, and from *Satan's Power to God*: And many there are among us, gathered out from Baptists, and other Churches and Peoples, who are Living Witnesses both of the blessed Operation and Effects of the Power and Ministry of Christ Jesus among us, which yet if the Baptists should object and say, *They see no such thing*, I answer,

swear, That is, because they have not Honestly made Tryal, but stood in Prejudice and Gain-saying, as many did against Christ, the Apostles and Primitive Church of old: However it is very Uncharitable for them, to conclude us No Christians; Either because They will not see us to be such, or because that at their faith-less Demands, we do not produce such mighty Signs, as they call for in their own Wills and Times; But a Foolish & Adulterous Generation seeks a Sign—being in the Unbelief, not acknowledging the Sufficiency of the Spirit's Teaching and Evidence, in that they own not the SPIRIT to be their RULE.

SECT. IV.

The Quakers clear from L. Muggleton's Principles, and the Baptists Agent's comparing them together, proved Scandalous and Wicked, &c.

T OUCHING the Comparison that is made between the Quakers and Muggleton

nians, it's both Idle Quibbling and Envious Canting to traduce and scandalize us; what if W. P. does not pretend to more than Muggleton does (nor to so much in some things) does it therefore follow, the Quakers are Impostors, or like him, who holds apparent Blasphemies in many Things, wherein W. P. and others of us have given publick Testimonies against him? The Baptists may be ashamed of such gross and abusive Insinuations as this, comparing the Quakers and Muggletonians; yea, and that in some Things wherein the Baptists and Muggletonians might as well, yea, and more truly be compared: As where it is said, Muggleton sayes, He is one of the two Witnesses spoken of in Rev. II. that God hath given Power to prophesie; and the Quakers say, they are the true Witnesses to the Light, and have received Power to preach the Everlasting Gospel, &c. And I may as well add, do not the Baptists profess themselves both to be true Witnesses of the Christ of God, and Preachers of him too? Muggleton hath several Disciples and Followers that believe him, and so have the Baptists. Muggleton curses and damns the Quakers; and what do Baptists less to Quakers and all others that will not be dipt by them, or do oppose them.

But

I. Muggleton

1. Muggleton sayes, *He has received Commission from Heaven.*
2. *That he had it by divine Revelation.*
3. *That he is inspired by the Spirit of God.*
4. *That he pretends to Infallibility.*

And what if *Quakers* pretend to these, as led by the Spirit of Truth? The Apostles and true Church did not only pretend to, but experience the same, does it therefore follow that they must be compared with the *Muggletonians*, and be deemed *Impostors*; And the *Baptists* the true Ministry and Church, and yet have no Commission from Heaven, either to *dip* or *damn* People; but deny divine Revelation, immediate Inspiration and Infallibility? Let them answer for themselves.

It's said, Muggleton denies that the Father and Son are two distinct Persons: And have not the *Baptists* done as much in these Words; *Jesus Christ, God, Man, a Person without you?* See *Dial.* 1. p. 9. wherein they imply the Father and the Son, or God and the Man *Christ*, to be but one Person without us, whereas we tell them 'tis not a Scripture Phrase.

But seeing *Muggleton* pretends some Things that both the *Baptists* and *Quakers* hold; would the *Baptists* be therefore included

cluded in the Comparifon with the *Muggletonians*? Might they not at this rate as well make all *Protestants* to be *Papists*; yea, *Jews*, *Mahometans*, &c. becaufe all agree in fome Truths?

But the Comparifon-Maker was not fo honeft as to fhew wherein the *Quakers* differ with and oppofe *Muggleton*, as a *Blasphemer* and *Impaftor*: As *Muggleton* holds thefe falfe and *Blafphemous Doctrines*, which the *Quakers* utterly deny.

1. That the Breath of Life God breathed into Adam (which made his Soul fo live) is mortal and doth dye.

2. That Adam's Soul did dye, viz. with the Body.

3. That the Soul of Man is mortal.

Do not fome of the *Baptifts* hold the fame?

4. That to fay, the Soul departs from the Body, when it dyes, is an ignorant, dark Opinion of many People, contrary to Senfe, Reason or Faith.

5. That Death took Chrifts Soul into it.

6. That Lazarus his Soul was dead in the Grave, where his Body was thofe four Days.

7. That not only Adam's Soul did dye, but alfo that the Soul of Chrifft did dye.

8. That all mens Souls ever fince are being mortal.

Thus far all the Baptists, who hold the Mortality of the Soul, agree with Muggleton.

9. That Solomon was ignorant in this Point (in saying) the Body to the Dust, and the Spirit returns to God that gave it.

10. That God was born of Mary.

11. That God is not an Infinite Spirit filling all Places.

12. That the Godhead Life dyed, that when Christ dyed, God dyed.

13. That Christ, being God embodied with Flesh and Bone (one Person without us) cannot be in the Quakers.

14. That there are many vast Places in the Earth where God is not at all.

15. That God himself is a single Person, in form of a Man, and no bigger in Compass or Bulk (and was so from Eternity) than a Man, even of the same Stature as the first Adam was.

16. That Reason is the Devil.

17. That all Men have received the Seed (or Spirit of Reason) from the Devil or rather from an Angel.

18. That the Devil became Flesh, Blood and Bone.

19. That Cain was none of Adams Son or Offspring, but the first Devil in Flesh.

20. That Eve was wth Child of Cain by the Devil.

the Serpent-Angel before Adam knew her.

21. That then the Condition of Eve was much like the Condition of Mary the Virgin; being with Child by the Holy Ghost before Joseph knew her.

22. That the Devil that tempted Christ, was a Man.

Thus far of Muggleton in his Looking-Glass for G. Fox; and other Books of his and John Reeve's, are replenisht with such absurd and blasphemous Stuff which we never were guilty of, but alwayes abhorred, and often testified against, as we have had Occasion; therefore let the World judge how grossly and wickedly we are dealt with and scandalized in the *Baptists* or their Abettors, comparing us with Muggleton, between whom there is as much Distance and Opposition, as betwixt Heaven and Hell, Light and Darkness.

Sect. V.

The Quakers further unjustly compared, and Baptists proved so Deny the Divinity of Christ.

Pag. 36. **B**Ut we are further catechised :
If our Ministers ought to be believed on easier Terms then Christ and his Ministers were (that is, on such Signs, and Wonders, and Miracles, and Gifts of the Holy Ghost, as God did bear them witness with, Acts 2. 22. Heb. 2. 3, 4.) And why must we be put upon this Proof, or else be judg'd not only No Christians, but Impostors? But because we bring New Doctrines and New Revelations (as we are accused) But what these New ones are, and wherein contrary to the ancient Christian Apostolical Doctrines, we are not yet convinc'd by all the Oppositions we have met withal.

It is further added, That some of which are not such New Discoveries from Heaven manifest by the Light within, as pretended, being in Truth but the Old Fancies of Sabellius re-

vived

vived and new vampir, not heard of till long after Christ, and then quickly exploded the Church about 1400. Years ago, pag. 36.

I must needs say, that as this Accuser's smiting at us is in the dark herein; for he does not lay down these old exploded Fancies of *Sabellius*, or tell us particularly what they are, but thus in dark & general Terms is smiting and squibbing at us, and abusing his Readers, as if they were all bound to believe his *Accusations* on his bare Word: But what were those Fancies or Opinions of *Sabellius*, and such others that were exploded as *Heterodox* or *Heresial*? It's reported, 'That their Books contain many Blasphemies against the Almighty God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and withal, much Incredulity touching his only-begotten Son and First begotten of all Creatures, and the word Incarnate, and senseless Ignorance of the Holy Ghost, *Euseb.* lib. 7. fol. 125. ch. 5. As also those that denyed Christ to have been God from Everlasting, and affirmed, that by Nature he was but only a bare Man; as it is said the Followers of *Paulus Samosatenus* did: Such disapprey'd the Essence and Divinity of Christ, which hath been before all worlds; and such as confound the Father, the Son and Holy Ghost,

D

imagining

*'imagining Three Names in One Thing and
'in One Person, Soc. Schol. l. 2. ch. 15.*

But we are sure that we are clear from all such Opinions, as *Denying the Deity or Divinity of the Son of God*, or his being that Word that became Flesh, and so from affirming him to be but only a bare Man: As also we never went about to confound the *Father and Son*, truly consider'd according to Scripture-Testimony; or to deny either the *Property, Relation, Manifestation or Operation of Father or Son*; though the one Divine Being of *Father, Son and Holy Spirit* from Everlasting, we have and must confess; Let it suffice, that as we confess to the *Father's* bringing or sending forth the *Son*, both from his own Being and Substance; as also to his taking Flesh and the perfect Manhood upon him in due time; and that we really believe his *Sonship* (and all this according to Scripture) so that he was and is the *Christ of God*, the same yesterday, to day and for ever; And therefore to compare us with *Sabellius*, or such as before mention'd, is very Envious and Unjust.

But that *Epapists* have done no less than denyed the *Deity of the Son of God*, or *Divinity of Christ*, appears in what follows.

John Newman's Argument:

If Christ as Christ, was not from the Beginning;

inning; then Christ was not the Word from the Beginning:

But Christ as Christ, was not from the Beginning;

Therefore, Christ was not the Word from the Beginning, pag. 52. of his Book, entitul'd The Light Within.

Mark here, Though he grants Christ and the Word to be one and the same; yet this *Argument* denies him to be either Christ, or the Word from the Beginning: What was he then? He tells us not. Doth not this oppose the *Divinity of Christ*, or *Deity of the Son of God*? to affirm, that *He was neither as Christ, nor the Word from the Beginning; for, The Word was with God, and the Word was God.*

And T. Hucks, ameng much more of his idle *Quibbling* and *Opposition*, thus queries, viz.

I ask thee, if Christ signifie Anointed, and God be Christ, as thou [Quaker] affirmest, Whether God himself e anointed? Dial. 3. pag. 32.

Mark here who is the *Quibbler* irreverently reflecting upon *Scripture Language*; But unto the Son he saith, *Thy Throne, O God! is for ever; a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of thy Kingdom; Thou hast loved Righteousness and hated Iniquity; Therefore*

Dⁿ

God

God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the
 Oyl of Gladness above thy Fellows, Hebr. x.
 8, 9. Psal. 45. 6, 7. But these Baptists are
 willing to throw off God being Christ, with
 [as thou affirmest] which is not, as they af-
 firm them; I ask then, If they own that Christ
 is God? Or that as the Son (who is God) he
 be anointed as he is the Son? And If He was
 the Son of God, and so Christ, before his In-
 carnation or assuming Flesh? However these
 men appear Socinianized now, and boggle
 at this Pre-Existence of Christ, and seem to
 define or limit him, only as a Person without
 us in Flesh; yet formerly some of their
 Brethren have confessed, That Christ is
 God, That Christ is call'd the Spirit, 2 Cor.
 3. 17 yea, that The Father hath put his
 Name upon him, Exod. 23. 21. And that it is
 the Christ that is there spoken of, is manifest,
 That the Father hath put his Name upon him,
 so far as He is call'd the Father, Isa. 9. 6. See
 their Book, entitul'd, *A Way to Zion*, p. 102.

I pass by several Falshoods, traducing and
 canting Language in the said *Qu. Quibbles*;
 and grant that at length, that the Author hath
 shewn himself more ingenious then in all the
 Book besides, where he concludes thus, viz.

If

If I have mistaken thee, or any of thy Friends, it is not willingly; and if thou shewst me honestly wherein, I will beg thy Excuse; I not pretending to Infallibility, my Opinion being still so long as we are men, in this Condition, *Humanum est errare*. But he should have consider'd this at the Beginning of his Book, and have been more submissive and gentle in his Work, being so subject to Mistake.

THE

T H E
Second Treatise,
Wherein the
Forger's Compurgators
Are IMPEACHED,

In a strict Examination of divers Citations
and Doctrinal Matters in their Book, entituled, *The*
Quakers Appeal answered, or a full Relation of
the Occasion, Progress and Issue of a Meeting
held in Barbican the 28th of August last
past (as their Sey'e is.)

Which Meeting was held by the *Baptists* to
clear *T. Hicks*, to charge and insult over the *Qua-*
kers in their Absence, as the Mannagement
and Issue thereof hath manifested

This is published not only for want of Justice
from them, but because of the Injustice of those
Baptists so deeply concerned for their Brother
Th. Hicks, against the People of God
called Quakers

George Whitehead.

He looked for Iudgment, but behold Oppression; for
Righteousness, but behold a Cry.
Under Falshood have they hid themselves.

11
Second
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900

1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912

1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000

2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100

THE
Second Treatise,
Wherein the *Forger's Comparators* are
Impeached.

A Brief Introduction.

THat these Men, who have undertaken to answer our *Appeal* against *Tho. Hicks*, have pretended very fair in Words, is undeniable; but how they have performed and answered is already manifest, and will further appear in divers Particulars, wherein I do complain against them both of their *Injustice*, *Partiality* and *false Testimony*, and affirm that they have neither approv'd themselves *Just Judges*, nor *faithful Witnesses*, in matters plain and obvious (nor yet clear'd *T. Hicks*)

In their *Title-Page* they say, *Wherein the Allegations of William Penn in two Books lately published by him against T. Hicks, were answer'd and disprov'd.*

This is a manifest *Untruth* as any Impartial Eye may see who is willing but to compare

pare this their *Barbican Relation*, styl'd *The Quakers Appeal answered*, with *W. Penn's* two Books, the one entitul'd *Reason against Railing*, and the other, *The Counterfeit Christian detected*; wherein many things are alledged and charged against *T. Hicks*, both of vile Forgeries, black Slanders, gross Perversions, self-Contradictions, &c. which are not so much as particularly mention'd, or touch'd in their said *Relation*; and some of those things they have medled with, were never so charg'd upon him, as under the Notion of vile Forgeries, &c. nor in such things wherein he had truly cited our Words: We have not charg'd him for *True Citations*, nor for meer *Mistakes*; but, for plain *Forgeries*, *Falshoods*, and *Slanders* wilfully contrived by himself (about which, and not to judge of *Doctrine*, the *Appeal* was made) as doth appear in the two Books, and our late Charge exhibited against him, which we could never obtain a fair Tryal of *T. Hicks* upon, from these his *Abettors & Compurgators*, but *Diversions* and *Interruptions*, as the late Meetings with them, at *Barbican* and near *Spittlefields*, did witness, contrary to their fair and smoooth Pretences following, viz.

Now forasmuch as *T. Hicks* is a Member with us, having so heavy a Charge exhibited against

against him, viz. a **FORGER** and **LYAR**,
 we could do no less then desire T. H. to give
 us a Publick Meeting, that we might hear
 " what he could say hereunto; " when it is pro-
 and if he had done them ANY bable, they had
WRONG, either by Mis- heard that before
 quoting of them in any of their the Meeting.
 Books, or Slandering of them in any thing he
 had charg'd them with, that we might, if any
 such thing appear'd, discharge that Duty to-
 wards him as becomes us, viz. Either to bring
 him to acknowledge his Evil as publickly as he
 had wrong'd them; or to have disown'd him
 as a Person unworthy of Countenance among
 us, in case he should refuse so to do, is being
 altogether contrary to our Principle. and Pra-
 ctice to allow any among us, that shall either in
WORD or **DEED** wrong any sort of Men.

To their Letter annexed thereunto these
 Names are subscribed.

William Kiffin,	Hanson Knowls,
Thomas Paul,	Laurence Wyse,
Henry Ferry,	James Jones.

And further in their Epistle they proceed,
 viz.

According to the Time appointed we did meet;
 T. Hicks charg'd them with several Opinions,
 and produced the Books of such as have been
 and

and now are chief Leaders among the Quakers, for his own Discharge from Forgery; and that all Plainness might appear, we ordered another Person in the Meeting to read the said Books according as they were cited by T. Hicks: Upon the reading of which we found them to agree with what he had laid to the Quakers Charge, which the following Narrative will give you a more full Account of; So that hitherto we see no Cause of just blame to be laid upon T. Hicks.

[And further they add] That if W. Penn, or G. Whitehead, or any other leading Quaker have any New Matter to object against T. Hicks, of which he hath not clear'd himself publicly: If they please to signify the Particulars thereof to us in Writing, with their Hands to it, we shall return such Answer thereunto, either by a Publick Meeting, or otherwise, as to us may seem just; and that may be to the Satisfaction of all indifferents and unprejudiced Minds; for we hope that nothing shall lye upon us in point of Duty towards T. H. but that by the Grace of God we shall be ready to do it.

William Kiffin,

Daniel Dyke,

Thomas Paul,

Hanson Knowls,

Henry Forry.

From

From all which it may be observ'd their fair Pretence in the first place, That if T. H. had done us any Wrong, as by his Misquoting or Slandering us, a fair Duty had been to him to bring him to acknowledge his Evil as publicly as he had wronged us, or to have defended him, &c.

1. Neither of which They have done, though his Slanders are made appear in 2. and my Answers; as also when we press for a further hearing thereof in publick, we were by them diverted; and since, they proposed for a private Meeting, to go through the Particulars of our Charge; but some of their Proposals we could not yield to, and our particular Answer thereunto, with our Reasons how far we could comply, they would not be so moderate as to treat about when it was read, but parted in a Huff, and after sent us an Angry Letter not at all tending to a Compliance, or further Treating for a Meeting.

2. And it is further to be observed, that these men take it for granted, that for those Opinions T. Hicks charged us with, he produced the Books of such as have been and now are CHIEFLY LEADERS among us, for his own Discharge from Forgery, and therefore that hitherto they see no Cause of just Blame to be laid upon him; Whereas it will further appear

appear, that as to those *Opinions* he hath particularly charged upon us in their said *Relation*, divers are Unfairly and Falsly cited; others that concerned matter of *Fact*, not cited out of any of our Books, or any one's that either is, or ever was Eminent among us as *Leaders*, or otherwise, but *Apostates* and *Adversaries*; Other things also for which he produceth no *Citations*; others charged and cited out of his own Books, which his pretended *Proofs* therein do not at all make good.

3. That concerning t^e late *Tryals* that we have had of these *Baptists* in Publick, their Carriage towards us hath not been to the Satisfaction of any indifferent or unprejudiced Minds, who beheld them and their *Injustice*: But however, this Good hath been brought forth, That many are awakened, and the Eyes of many are opened through these Bussels and Contests, to take notice and see these men's Unfairness and Partiality; and also to enquire more after Truth and Religion then heretofore.

After T. *Hicks* hath gone through the 12. *Particulars* of his *Charge* that concern *Doxtrins*, and his 19. that concern *Fact*, together with those *Quotations* he pretends for
Proofs,

Proof, we have this Testimony given on his behalf : viz.

We whose Names are here underwritten, do certify, that the afore-said Quotations are truly recited out of those Books to which they refer, witness our Hands,

My Occasion calling me from the Meeting before the End thereof; But since having perused the Proofs, by Comparing them with the Quakers Books whence they are cited, I find them to agree; witness my Hand,

William Kiffin.

*Daniel Dyke
Hanson Knowlton
John Gosnell
Thomas Paul
Henry Forry
John Norcot
Thomas Wilcocks
Robert Snelling
Maurice Kings
Jonathan Jennings
John Singleton
Thomas Plant
Joseph Marton
Owen Davis
John Hunter
John Snelling
William Dix
John Vernon
Edward Noble
Robert Mason
James Barton*

Observe

Observe here how all these Men have engaged themselves for the clearing of T. H. and how they have espoused his Work against us, so that they are now accountable for those Misstatements and Abuses in his *Dialogues*, which we have charged upon him: And further see, how he & they had laid and fitted their Matter for such a *Publick Meeting*, managed on his Behalf in our Absence, when W. P. and I were (as we had been some Time) remote from the City: And although W. Kiffin left the Meeting before the End thereof, he could both be Judge and Witness (as well as the rest) for him, from the Perusal and comparing of his Proofs with the *Quakers Books* (which the rest might have done perusively as well) now my present Business is, to prove them both *Unfaithful & False Witnesses*, as well as *Unjust Judges*, even as to Citations, as will appear plainly (although they would fain have had us acquiesced with their Judgments, as being *Infallible Judges*, because *appealed to*) but here its proved, That the *Quakers Books* do not agree with what T. H. hath said to their Charge, and that all his *Quotations* are either *misquoting* out of their Books, take the following Instances (being compared out of their own Relation aforesaid, with what is briefly noted thereupon.

(27)

Sect. 1.

About the Soul.

BECAUSE T. H. hath made a great doo
divers Times about the Soul, as char-
ging was the *Quakers Opinion*; one while,
that the Soul is God; another while, that
the Soul is Part of God, and of God's Being,
without Beginning and Infinite. Dial. 1. p. 16.
Dial. 3. p. 2. I shall begin with this; where,
after he hath cited W. P. as charging T. H.
with Perversion, Injustice, Misreading and
Abusing the true Meaning of what is truly
said; he here breaks off W. P.'s Words, and
then saith to his Auditors, You hear what
W. Penn hath said touching this Charge, p. 8.
Whereas he hath but cited the Preamble of
W. Penn's Answer, and left out the very Sub-
stance thereof. See Real. as Rail. p. 85.
Is this fair Dealing, or true; to say, You have
heard W. H. A. T. W. P. hath said; when
they have not heard the very Substance and
Chief Part of what he hath said in this Case,
which follows after T. H.'s Citation; W. P.
thus

thus, viz. 'G. Fox saith thus; God breathed
 'into Man the *Breath of Life*, and he became
 'a living Soul, and is not this of God, of his
 'Being? &c. and is not This that came out
 'from God, Part of God, and from God?
 'Where nothing can well be clearer, then
 'that G. F. intends that *Divine Life, Power*
 'and *Virtue*, by which Adam in Soul and
 'Body came to live to God (with other Pas-
 'sages about the Words *Breathed, Inspired*;
 'after which he addeth) 'But this Ungodly
 'Person would infer from our asserting, That
 'the *Breath* God breathed into Adam's Soul
 'whereby it liv'd to God, was of God's Di-
 'vine Life, That the Soul of Man, as a meer
 'Creature or created Capacity, is of God's own
 'Being and Substance, &c. See further Reas.
 'against Rail, pag. 66, 67.

And further let it be observed; wherein
 T. Hicks hath dealt Unfairly by G. F. in this
 matter [Though it be true that G. F. saith,
 That God breathed into Man the *Breath of*
Life and he became a living Soul; and askt,
 Is not this which cometh out from God, of God,
 being without Beginning, Infinite in it self, &c?
 Gr. Myst. fol. 29, 68, 90, 100.] But then
 T. Hicks having left out those Passages that
 chiefly explain G. F.'s Sense in this matter,
 takes it for granted, without Distinction,
 that

that it is our Opinion, That the Soul is God
 (as he hath charg'd us) and this he hath made
 one main Reason for his accusing us with *De-*
nying all future & distinct Beings or V. Dist. 1.
Rewards of Men after Death (which p. 62, 75.
 must procede either from his Mi-
 stake, or wilful *Perversian*) he taking G. F.'s
 Question about the Soul, to intend the meer
Spiris of Man that God form'd in him, or the
 Soul, that is, a *Reasonable Creature*; which
 could not be intended in G. F.'s Question,
 which concerns that *Immediate Breath*, or
Spirit of Life, which came out from God, by
 which Man became a living Soul; wherein
 what is more evident then that G. F. doth
 not at all confound the *Being of Man* with
 the *Being of his Maker* [though God may
 be truly said to be the *Being of Beings*, the
Life of Lives, & so the Soul (or Life) of Souls,
 even of all Mankind] with respect unto this
 G. F.'s words appear very plain, where he
 saith, *God breathed into Man the Breath of*
Life, and he became a living Soul; for that
which came out from God, was the Cause that
MAN became ALIVE, a living Soul; and is
this of God? Gr. *Must* pag. 62. See how
 plain and distinct these words are, between
 That which came out from God, and Man
 himself; and whether it was not an *Abuse* in

T. H. H. to leave out those G. F.'s explanatory words, which are in the very same Page that he quotes, and misconstrue his Question and Words to another Intention then they will bear; while G. F.'s words relating to that which came out from God, do not at all mention Man's Soul or Spirit, that I do or can find. Although T. H. and his Brethren take Soul (in G. F.'s Question) for the Spirit of Man, or the Reasonable Creature, so far as I can gather; as W. Kiffin and the rest do in their Epistle, entituled Heart-Bledings for Professors Abominations, and annex unto their Confession of Faith, printed 1651. where they have these Phrases, viz. The Spirit which God formeth in Man; Our Spirit or Soul; a Creature; The reasonable Soul, &c. Here they grant man's Spirit or Soul to be the same, whereas when G. F. speaks of the Soul in that sense, he hath this Phrase, The Soul being in Death, in Transgression, man's Spirit there is not sanctified, Gr. Myst. p. 91. These plain words T. H. also hath left out though in the very next page to what he quotes. What is more plain then that G. F. could not intend that Soul or Spirit of Man (which could be in Death, in Transgression) to be either God, his Divine Life, Being, or Part of God, but of Man only; for the
Being

Being of God can never be either in Transgression, or Corrupted; because *God is Incorruptible*; And now from the Understanding that I have of G. F's words about the *Soul*, as in divers places of his said Book; He speaks of the *Soul* as under a two fold Consideration; 1st, with respect unto that *Breath of Life*, which God breathed into man, by which MAN became a *living Soul*, 2dly, with the respect to *Man* himself, as being thereby made a *living Soul*. And of *Man*, as under a three fold Consideration; 1. As Man was in the Beginning (before the Fall) being made *Alive*, a *Living Soul*, by the *Breath* or *Spirit* of God. 2. To Man fallen, and in the Fall, from God; wherein his Soul or Spirit is brought under Death in Sin and Transgression, and so is polluted with Sin while Unsanctified. 3. To Man as restored, and his Soul quickned to God again by the Spirit of Life, and so saved by and in *Christ Jesus*, who is the *Bishop of the Soul*. This I do understand and plainly gather from the Tenour of G. F's Words and Answers.

But sith *Thomas Hick's* Charge against the *Quakers* was, that *they are No Christians*, and that one of his principal Allegations for Proof is, that their Opinion is, That *the Soul is God, or part of God, and of God's Being with*

out Beginning and Infinite, which perversly and darkly he hath drawn from G.F's meer Question (as plainly appears before) we had need to look the more strictly into the matter; Upon which I ask, If to put this Question [*Is not THAT of God, and of his Being, which came out from God, by which Man became a living Soul?*] be an Opinion sufficient to prove Us *No Christians?* Then, *Whether or no they are Christians, who say, that the Soul of Man is a Spirit, of the NATURE of God, which returns to God that gave it? And whether this be not as high an Assertion of the Soul of Man, as can be supposed G. F. ever asserted?* And that some Baptists have thus asserted of the Soul, see what they say in their own Instances and Words, viz. *That this is a known Truth, that every thing at its Dissolution dissolveth into its first Principles:*

1. *The Springs & Rivers run into the Sea from whence they came out, Eccles. 1. 7.*

2. *The Ice, Snow, Hail, that are congeal'd of Water, dissolve into Water, and out of Water they are congeal'd again.*

3. *The Light centereth into the Sun, which is the Fountain of Light, therefore in the Night time it is dark, and Moon and Stars give Light, as they are aspected to the Sun.*

4. *For Man at his Dissolution; 1. The SOUL*

SOUL being a Spirit, of the **NATURE** of God, is said to return to him that gave it; and the Body being made of the Dust, returns to the Dust again, *Eccle. 12. 7. & Gen. 3. 19.* saith God, *Thou shalt return to the Ground; for out of it thou wast taken.* Thus far **Dan. King** in his Book, entitul'd, *A way to Zion*, p. 92. printed at London, & reprinted at **Edenburgh** Anno 1656. and highly approved and commended by **T. Patens**, **J. Spalsbury**, **W. Kiffin** and **J. Pierston** who in their Epistle dedicatory give this Commendation, viz.

It hath pleased God, to stir up the Spirit of our Brother Dan. King, whom we judge a faithful and painful Minister of Jesus Christ, to take this Work in hand before us; and we judge that he hath been much assisted of God in the Work in which he hath been very painful.

Observe here, how it is affirmed, that the Soul is of the **NATURE** of God; and that according to the Instances before, of these things that return into their first Principles.

See now *Baptists* your own Doctrine about the Soul or Spirit of Man! Were you well advised to suffer your Brother so highly to charge and taunt at us about the Soul, because of **G. F.**'s Question which concern'd the *Breath* or Spirit of Life from God, by which *Man* became a Living Soul; when you tell

us

its plainly, that the Soul is a Spirit of the NATURE OF GOD? You would take it ill, if any should scornfully Dialogue upon you for this, as your Brother Hicks hath done upon us for G. F's Question; Is not That of God, which came out from God? &c. to wit, the Breath or Spirit of Life: with whose Words also about the Soul, agreeth *Isa. 42. 15. 11. Forasmuch as he knew not his Maker, and him that INSPIRED unto him an active Soul, and BREATHED in a Living Spirit.* See also VAVASOR POWEL'S Concordance about the Soul, viz. The Soul is put for the whole Person, *Acts 2. 41. & 7. 14.* it is put for Life, *Isa. 43. 12.* it is put for Breath, *Acts 20. 10. marg.* it is put for a Reasonable Creature, *Gen. 2. 7.* it is put for GOD HIMSELF, *Prov. 6. 16. marg. Hab. 10. 38.*

I suppose these men are not ignorant, both how this Concordance is approved, and the Author of it esteemed by them.

Seet.

Sect. I.

About the Person of Christ.

VWhereas T.H. to prove the *Quakers* deny *Jesus Christ* to be a distinct Person without us, quotes these words, viz. *Jesus Christ a Person without us, is not Scripture Language*, & for it quotes *Dip. Pl. p. 13.*

Whereas the Words there are, *Jesus Christ, God-man, a Person without thee* (as in his *Dial. 1. p. 9.*) is not *Scripture-Language*, &c. *Mark*, he hath left out the Words [*GOD MAN*] in the Citation; and in his two last *Dialogues*, likewise, *Dial. 2. p. 10. Dial. 3. p. 7.* So that it appears these *Witnesses* have either taken this defective Citation upon trust from T.H. and not from their own Sight and Knowledge, or else they have knowingly born *Witness* to this Abuse, & owned this defective & false Citation for a *Blind*. But how comes his Charge now to be so *low* against us, as only denying *Jesus Christ* to be a distinct Person without us, and he so hard put to it to prove this, when before he charged us in these Words, viz. *You reprobate the Scriptures and the Person of Jesus Christ without you*, *Dial. 1. p. 62.* O wonderful Impudence and Falshood! The Reason of my Answer

in this Case before to T.H. as also my own-
ing the Man, Christ Jesus as to his Being
without us as well as within us, is plainly
shewn in my Appendix to Reas. against Rail.
p. 17. my Words being thus, viz. Jesus
Christ, God-man, a PERSON without
thee; which Phrase I did, and do say, is not
Scripture-Language; but the Anthropomor-
phites who profess a Personal God, denying
him to be an Infinite Spirit; doth it there-
fore follow that I deny the Man Christ Je-
sus in his being either with-
Append. p. 17. out or within us? But
T.H.'s Words, God-man, a Person with-
out thee, equally excluding God under the
Limitation of Man and Person without us;
he is pleased now to leave out the word God-
man, & to accuse us of denying the Person of
Christ without us: He should have explain-
ed what he means by the Word Person; for
though we are not satisfied with the Words
before (being unscriptural) this is no de-
nying of Jesus Christ in his being either as
without us, or within us; we confessing,
that he is ascended into Glory far above all
Heavens, and that he is at the Father's right
Hand of Power in his Glorious Being —
which yet doth not exclude or limit him
from being within us. And its false that
we

‘we deny Christ to be a *Man*.
 — ‘His Exaltation and Glory Appendix,
p. 20, 21, 23.
 (‘into which he is ascended not
 ‘only into the Heavens, but far above all Hea-
 ‘vens) transcends that Degree attained in
 ‘these suffering earthly Tabernacles; his
 ‘inaccessible Glory is above Men and An-
 ‘gels, &c.

Again T. H. hath very unfairly cited but
 the Beginning of a Sentence of mine, lea-
 ving out the latter and chief Part thereof,
 viz. at [‘*Tis a Design of Satan to keep Men*
 ‘in carnal Imaginations and dark Thoughts of
 ‘a Human Personal Christ] And here they
 break off, leaving out the following Words of
 the same Sentence, which

are [‘*Consisting, * ei-*
 ‘ther of *Flesh, Blood and*
 ‘**Bones LIKE THEIRS,**
 ‘or of *Flesh and Bones*

See *Hen. Grigg's*
Light from the
Sun, p. 30. 31,
33, 34.

‘without Blood, and so of *God's right Hand,*
 ‘as limited to that Re-

‘moteness * That they
 neglect to wait for Christ's
 inward and spiritual Ap-
 ‘pearance, and the Know-
 ‘ledge of God's right Hand
 ‘near them, to save and
 ‘preserve them from Sin

See *J. Newman's*
Light within, p.
55, 66, 72. an-
swered by me in
my Book, Christ
ascended, p. 18,
19, 20, 21.

and

and Death: See my *Appendix to Reasons against Railing*, p. 27.

Now you that are T. H. his *Compurgators, Abettors and Witnesses*, See here how he and you have left out the very principal and explanative Part of the same Sentence; is this your Care and Justice? Would you be thus served, both to wrong me, and abuse the World or your Readers, to tell them, *The Quotations are truly recited out of our Books?* But if you take this kind of unfair curtailing (which destroyes the Sense) to be significant, to give the whole Sense of the Clause or Sentence before, and all this to prove us *No Christians*; Then it must be contrarywise given as your Opinion for Christianity, *That 'tis not a Design of Satan, to keep Men in carnal Imaginations of a human personal Christ, consisting of Flesh, Blood and Bones LIKE YOURS; but a Christian Opinion so to think of Christ and of God's right Hand, as limited to such Remoteness, as that you thereupon neglect to wait for Christ's inward and spiritual Appearance; or the Knowledge of God's right Hand near you to save you from Sin and Death; but that you may be good Christians, and yet guilty of such carnal Imaginations and sinful Neglect: If this be your Christianity, I hope, through the Grace*
of

of God, never to own it, any more than your unjust and partial Proceedings against us, to uphold and cover a *Forger*, to keep back Judgment from passing upon, contrary to your fair Pretences before cited: But T. H. hath declared, That *Dial. 3. p. 33.* he no where accuseth us for denying Christ's bodily Appearance; How then do we deny his Person? What was his Person, if not his Body?

Sect. III.

About the Bible and Scriptures.

Again you give this Passage, as truly recited among the rest, viz. G. W. accounts it Idolatry to call the Bible a Means of our knowing God, for which you quote *Dip. plung. p. 13.* Wherein is a manifest Untruth and Abuse; for in Answer to T. Hicks affirming, That the Bible is THE Means of our knowing God, *Dial. 1. p. 41.* My Words were, He idolatrously sets up the Bible in the Place of Christ; for no man knows the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son reveals him, *Mat. 11. 27.* *Dip. plung. p. 13.* Mark

Mark the Difference betwixt *A Means* and **THE Means**, as between the **BIBLE**, and **CHRIST**: That may be *A Means* which is not **THE Means**, Christ being the absolute Way and Means by Way of Eminency (for Man to come to & know God) & not the Bible, though it may be *a Means* instrumentally, as God bestows a Blessing upon (or accompanies) the serious Reading thereof, as it directs to Christ Jesus, or to his Light and Spirit, which openeth the Understanding in the holy Scriptures.

P. 17. Again, about my owning the *Speaking of the Spirit in any to be of greater Authority then the Scriptures or Chapters* [you unfairly leave out my following words, which explain my Sense and Intention, which are] viz. *as receiv'd, and proceeding from that Spirit and spoken in the Sense thereof; as, Christ's words were of greater Authority when he Spoke, then the Pharisees Reading the Letter, Ser. Apol. pag. 49.*

And we might farther add, that the same words of the holy Scripture are of more Authority and Efficacy, when the Spirit in any speaks them, or sets them home to the Conscience, then when any one Reads or Speaks them *without the Spirit*; and this not at all to undervalue the Truth of what is written: Nor did we ever prefer our *Books* before the *Bible*,

Bible, as unjustly we are charg'd, but do prefer the Bible before all other Books extant in the World, as we can sufficiently evince out of our Friends Writings.

And as for *Titles* given upon some of our Books, which is alledged as Proof against us, viz. *Voice of Wisdom; Breasings of True Love; A Shield of Truth; Light risen out of Darkness, &c.* but, saith T. Hicks, *The Scriptures are call'd, Dead Letter; Paper, Ink, and Writing; Carnal Letter, &c.* and all this to prove, *That we give the Preference to our own Books;* but he giveth us not any Quotation for all these Words or Titles, nor shews us, on what Occasion any of them were spoken; however his Brethren undertake to be *Witnesses* for him, in these Things with the rest: But herein he hath grossly abused us, and our Intention and Principle, which never was to bring our Books in Comparison with the Scriptures; nor have we given any such Titles, so to prefer our Books, but with respect unto the secret Breasings of True Love, and the Arising of the Light, or Signification of God's Voice in our Souls; Such Titles therefore have been not strictly, but figuratively placed upon some Books, and the Letter only made mention of in the Sense of the Apostle, in Distinction between

Judge Reader, how these *Baptists* are fallen into the Pit which they have dig'd for others, and how they are more highly concern'd in the same thing that they alledge against us, to prove us *No Christians*; But should any hereupon make a Comparison between the *Titles* they give to their own *Books*, and those they have given to the *Scriptures*, and thereupon should positively charge them with giving their own *Pamphlets* the Preference, they would take it very hardly; But if they can find any reasonable Allegations to bring themselves off from this confuting Objection that is retorted upon them, according to their own Method, they might in Charity have reserved a better Construction for us in the Case.

SECT. IV.

Of the Light within.

I May not well omit one Passage which is cast upon me as an Absurdity in their fourth Page, viz.

If the Life be the Divine Essence, the Light must be so also; for such On Joh. 1. 9
as the Cause is, such the Effect.

must

must be: Thus G. W. in a Manuscript.

Whereas it is not thus laid down, either in this Method or Form of Argument in any Manuscript of mine that I know of, or can remember, or find out; and yet I do own, That the *Life which is the Light of Men* (that true Light wherewith every man is enlightened, Joh. 1. 4. 9.) in its own Being is God and Christ; and not a meer Effect of Power, as a made or created Thing, but Divine and Increated: It appears that these Witnesses have received divers Things on the Credit of their Brother T. H. (who in like Manner layes down the Argument in his first Dialogue) yet they have the Confidence to subscribe thereto; though I confess I laid down my Reason to prove that *Life* (which is the Light of, and in Men) *Divine*; thus far, viz. *If that Life, which is the Light of Men, be of the divine Being, then the Light must be so also* [Unto which I may now add the following Proposition] *But that Life is of the Divine Being (or of a Divine Nature) therefore the Light of Men (spoken of Joh. 1. 4. 9.) must be so also.*

I also grant that the Cause and Effect were spoken of, upon T. H. his esteeming the Light within but an Effect, &c. to explain my Sense of the Cause and Effect (though not

not laid down in such an inconsistent Argument as is placed upon me) It was only admitted as between that Divine Life and its immediate Illumination or Lightning in Man, which naturally flows or proceeds from the Life; So that if I should go merely in the Form of Argument, there being different Causes and Effects; I should first distinguish between them; As there are *Causes* and *Effects* or Products of one Kind or Nature; so there are of different Kinds: As, the Sun and the Shining or Beams thereof are of one Kind, and the Fountain and Streams thereof are of one Kind or Nature; but so are not the Carpenter and the House that he makes, &c. as I plainly signified my Intention and Sense about that *Immediate Light in Man*, being *Divine & Supernatural*; by a Reason of the contrary; 'As the Light or Immediate Shining of the Sun in the Firmament is Natural, because the Sun it self is a Natural Light; so the Immediate Illumination or Shining of God in Man's Heart or Conscience, must needs be Divine and Supernatural, because he himself is so, who is the Fountain of Light; That Eternal Life which was with the Father, 1 Joh. 1. 2. is Divine, and that Life was and is the Light of Men, Job. 1. 4. And so 'tis God who hath shined

*shined in our Hearts to give the Light of the
 Knowledge of the Glory of God in the Face
 of Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. 4:6. And his shi-
 ning (we hope) will not now be denyed
 to be Divine, being immediately of and
 from himself; and he so shined in their
 Hearts before they were come to the Know-
 ledge of the Glory of God in the Face of
 Christ Jesus, in Order to give them that
 Knowledge: And I further add, let it
 therefore suffice that it is my Principle, That
 the Life, which is the Light of Men, menti-
 oned Joh. 1. 4. 9. is Divine, Supernatural, and
 so Increat'd; and it was never my Judg-
 ment or Words, that it was but a mere Effect
 (as a Thing made) but that in its own Being
 'tis no other then the Life of God, and so
 himself; and that every Measure or Degree
 of his Immediate Light, Inthining or Illumi-
 nation in Man is Divine and Spiritual, and
 able to direct the Soul to God & Christ from
 whence it cometh, knowing also that God's
 Love and Grace in Christ is universal and
 free to all Mankind. And why we should
 be Unchristian'd for confessing, Christ to
 be that Light which enlightneth every Man
 that comes into the World, or for saying,
 that the Light in Men is Divine, I do not un-
 derstand, since T. H. himself hath confes-
 sed,*

fed, *That Christ is the Life and Light of men,* Dial. 1. p. 22. Though this he hath often contradicted, and since made it an Article against us to prove us *No Christians*, that we hold, *That the Light wherewith every Man is enlightened, is God, when he himself hath confessed, that it is Christ; as namely, That Christ is the Life and Light of Men.*

Sect. V.

A slanderous Accusation of T. Hicks's against the Quakers, removed.

AS to Matter of Fact. Whereas we are charg'd to say, *That it concerns us to render our Adversaries as ridiculous as we can, and to make our Friends believe they do nothing but contradict themselves; and if this fail, that we will insinuate by way of Question something that may be a Slander to them,* Dial. 1. pag. 72. and Qu. Ap. answ. pag. 22.

To prove this Charge T. Hicks saith, that G. W. in his Answer to Mr Danson insinuates a Slander upon him by way of Question (by saying) *That he styleth himself Minister of the Gospel at Sandwich; but is not rather*

that Report of him true, That he is given to Gaming and Bowls, &c?

And again, T. H. addeth, *This Question was put meerly to slander him.*

A notorious Untruth! It was not put with any such Intent as meerly to slander him; for it is true that such a Report was given to me of him, and seem'd not improbable, or then incredible to me, such *Recreations* (so call'd) being common to men of his Coat. It is true that by the *Question* before, I did oppose a *Gamster* or *Player at Bowls*, to a Minister of the Gospel; but that I neither made the Report, nor design'd to slander T.D. by way of Question, or otherwise, as I am slanderously accused, see the following Certificate:

As concerning the Report that hath been made Question of, touching T. Dansop's exercising himself at Bowls, &c. when Minister at Sandwich; I can certifie that I had this Report from an Independent who was an Inhabitant at Sandwich, and who, if Occasion require, I question not but will evidence it; and accordingly I made mention of this Report to George Whitehead, witness my Hand,

Isaac Chatwode.

Now judge, serious Reader, how unjustly T. H. hath represented me, as putting the Question

Question *merely to slander T. D.* (whether he be concern'd, or not, I determine not) which thing hath been perversly hinted in several *Pamphlets* against us : And whether or no, the said Question doth prove it our *Answer, Words or Principle*, to say, *That it concerns us to render our Adversaries as ridiculous as we can ; or that we will insinuate by way of Question something that may be a Slander to them*, as T. H. hath *Dialogued* the Matter in our Name after a most abusive sort beyond all Bounds of Honesty or Civility ; who farther attempts to prove that my Question before was put, *merely to slander him*, from what *W. F.* alledges in this very thing, which is, *'Who knows not that the Priests give themselves a Liberty in more then that ? What Game do they almost scruple to play at ?* which is so far from proving that the Question was *askt, merely to slander him*, that it rather renders the *Report* credible, or at least that we might suppose, there was some Ground for it ; and to be sure, this Instance is far enough from making good *T. Hicks's* Charge against the *Quakers*, as before ; but sufficient to shew his great *Malice & Falsehood*; and these Coverings will not hide him : It is his own Sin, to insinuate by way of Question, to *slander us* ; for thus he hath done by

us and our Sufferings, witness his base and Deceitful Questions, insinuating, that the Satisfaction of our Wills and Lusts, the promoting our Carnal Interests, is, or may be our chief Motive or Inducement, to suffer as we use to do, Dial. 1. pag. 75.

This he hath made no Scruple to insinuate by Way of Question against us, and yet maketh it a great Crime, to ask a Question that seem'd probable about a Report of a Parish Priest's Playing at Bowls.

And be it noted also, that for a further Proof of his Charge against us, he brings this Instance, pag. 24. viz. If any Persons write or speak their Grief that the publick take notice of it, they will represent them under such Terms as may render them Odious, and the more effectually to weaken their Testimonies, they will fix upon them scurrilous and contemptible Appellations, and to prevent any Inquisition into the Truth of the Matter they would make People believe that they are Envious, Malicious, Dirty, Factions and Ranting Scirrus. And for these general Accusations (which we may say, are very Abusive and False) he quotes Spir. of the Hat, pag. 36, 37. which is so far from being any of our Books, or any one's Eminent among us, that it was an Envious Apostate's, a Libellous Pamphlet, yet promoted

sed and spread by some *Baptists* against us, who are beholding to *Apostates* and *Backsliders* for their Engines to work against the People of God call'd *Quakers*, who have retained their Integrity in the Truth; But the said *Lying Pamphlet* styl'd *The Spirit of the Hat*, was plainly opposed and seriously answer'd by our Friends in their Book, entitul'd *The Spirit of Alexander the Coppersmith*, &c. yet the *Baptists* in their *Preface*, would make the World believe, That the Books (produced and cited by T. Hicks for his Discharge from Forgery) were the Books of such as have been and now are Chief Leaders among the *Quakers*; but neither tell us *Who*, nor *What Chief Leader* the Author of the *Spirit of the Hat* ever was or is among us. Now you that have concern'd your selves for T. Hicks, Do you think to acquit him from Forgery by such Proceeding? Have you approv'd your selves either *Just* or *Impartial Men*, to admit of our Adversary's *Accusations* for *Proof*, to Clear your Brother T. Hicks, and Blemish us? No, No; Such Work will neither clear you nor him, while *Justice and Truth* is slain in your Streets, and you have not suffer'd *Equity* to enter: You are *Witnesses* on behalf of a *Forger*, and your *Confederacy* therein is *Impious*, and God will break it and bring you to Judgment.

Seet.

Sect. VI.

About our Ministers & our owning the Scriptures.

ANd also *Thomas Hicks* having falsely accused us, *That we appoint our Ministers aforehand to speak in such a Place at such a Time*, Dial, 2. p. 66. For Proof of this he again citeth that lying Pamphlet, *Spir. of Hat*, in these Words; *What meaneth* (saith he of the *Quakers*) *that certain Persons are appointed to spend the whole Time in speaking in every Meeting, and all the rest to come as Hearers, neglecting the Gift in themselves, only waiting upon their Lips, Spirit of the Hat*, p. 29.

Which is also as arrant a Falshood as his Charge before; for 1st, we do not so appoint our Ministers or certain Persons before hand to speak in such a Place and Time, or to spend the whole Time in speaking. 2^{dly}, Neither do the rest of the Hearers neglect their Gift, or only wait upon their Lips, but upon the Lord, and all are referred to the Guidance of God's free Spirit in themselves, having

having a free Liberty therein to improve and make Use of their Gifts, as God shall call, there being both Gospel Liberty and Order among us, and *the Spirit of the Prophets subject to the Prophets*; and Gospel-Ministers have Unity in the Spirit, and with one anothers Testimony, which is not of Man, nor by the Will of Man: However, these *Baptists* seek to clear their Brother by such false Stories as before, scraped out of an *Apostate* and Enemies Pamphlet.

Another Charge, falsely insinuating, *That we do not really or fully own the Holy Scriptures*, is this, viz. *That the Quakers own the Scripture as far as it agrees to the Light in them*: And for Proof of this *T. Hicks* saith, *This is proved in their asserting the Scriptures to be given forth from the Light within*.

Whereas this is a Proof, that we fully own the Scriptures without any such Exception or Reservation, as is implied in the Charge before; for it is apparent, that we fully own the *Light* within to be *Infallible*, and therefore the Scriptures which came from it to be really true: However, the *Dialogueman* would be accounted a very exact Drawer of Consequences, even such an one as would not abate a Word of his *Dialogues*, but would

would have them be believed as *Real Truths*, though they be *no Real Discourses*, as he hath since confessed, in Answer to *T. R's* Objection, That the *Dialogue* is presented to the World, as a *Real Discourse*; to which he answers, *I do assure him it was not so understood or intended by me in the publishing of it* (he should then have told the World so) but then he adds, *though it be as True and Real, as though it had been a Verbal Discourse*; whenas much of his *Dialogues* is made up of *Consequences* of his own framing, yet he hath sought to make the World believe, that the Answers given are *no other then what the Quakers give*; and that the Matters he had objected were *Real Truths and no Fictions*: But doth not his Charge and Consequence before imply such Untruth as this his unjust Charge, *That the Quakers undervalue or slight the Holy Scriptures, or account them of no more Authority then Esop's Fables*? And that all this follows from their asserting the *Scriptures to be given forth from the Light within, which they so highly esteem of and own to be Infallible*? Yea, and he has procur'd many Witnesses and Abettors also to subscribe his Work; but they should more strictly have examined his Proofs and Consequences.

Sect. VII.

Sect. VII.

How T. H. begun his second Dialogue with a Forgery and his Deceitful Shift for it.

W Hereas T. Hicks in his second Dialogue begun with this Charge and Question; viz. *I have formerly detected you of several pernicious Opinions concerning the Scriptures, the Light within, the Person of Christ, and the Resurrection of the Dead, &c. which I presume by this time you have consider'd, what say you thereunto?*

To which he gives this Answer in the Quakers Name, viz. *I say the Plagues and Judgments of God will follow thee [and to this subscribeth] George Whitehead.*

But T. Hicks's Abuse and Falshood herein was detected in W. P's Answer to his last Dialogue, *Counterf. Christian*, pag. 19, 20, 21. As also his Forgery herein laid upon him in my Appendix to Reason ag. Reason, p. 13. Howbeit, he is not ashamed in the *Barbican Relation* to say, *The Truth of this Answer see attested under Mr John Gladman's hand, Dial. 7. pag. 89.*

I do not think that *T. Hicks* can be ignorant of his wittingly wronging both me and *John Gladman* in this case; for observe, doth *Jo. Gladman* in the place quoted attest, that this was *G. W's Answer* to the Question to which it is annexed by *T. H.* in *G. W's Name*? No. But that *G. W.* spake the Words in Discourse with him; that is, with *John Gladman*; Not to *T. H.* in Answer to his Question: If *J. Gladman* speak his Conscience, he dare not attest that this was *G. W's Answer* to this Question to which it is here adjoyned as his Answer or saying thereunto; Therefore *T. H.* is a Forger, and hath cheated his Witnesses, and drawn in *J. Gladman* for a Cover to his Deceit; which shews his Spirit and Work to be in the Dark, like that of an Impostor and Juggler in these matters; And Men fearing God, would be ashamed either to be his Witnesses, or to countenance, or encourage him therein. Although I deny not, that I spake any such Words against *T. H.* at any time, as *J. G.* hath unfairly represented me, in telling the World, That *G. W.* denyeth he said so. (against *T. Hicks*) Dial, 3. pag. 85. for my Answer shews the contrary in my said Appendix, p. 13. though still I deny that to be my Answer unto *T. H's* Question before; however, as I did not question (as in my Appendix)

per d. x) but that the *Judgments of God* would follow *T. Hicks* for his *Forgeries & Slanders*; so I am of the same mind still, and may so speaking I neither did give, nor do give for an Answer to his particular Questions: But in his fictitiously placing it, as my saying to that one Question before, he might as well have made it serve to every Question in all his *Dialogues*, which was never so intended nor spoken by me; but with reference to his *Forgeries and Slanders* in general.

There are divers other things in their *Relation* aforesaid, which concern *Geo. Keith*, *W. Penn* and others, that we might justly except against, but they are answered elsewhere, and we could have wish'd, that you who are *T. H's* *Witnesses*, would have seriously perus'd our former *Answers* to *T. H.* wherein his *Forgeries, Slanders, Perversions* and plain *self-Contradictions* are laid open, particularly in those Books, entitul'd, *Reason against Railing*, and *Counterfit Christian detected*, from page 6. to p. 54. this might both have prevented that *Disgrace & Trouble* that is since befalln you, by engaging for such an *Agent*; and that you would be pleas'd yet seriously to view all the *Controversies*, you may perceive many Particulars charg'd against *T. Hicks*, which neither himself, nor
you

